



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/575,123	05/23/2000	Kia Silverbrook	NPA006US	9158

24011 7590 10/04/2004

SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD
393 DARLING STREET
BALMAIN, 2041
AUSTRALIA

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/575,123

Applicant(s)

SILVERBROOK ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 18-21, 23-29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 May 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/2/01.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded to update the status of co-pending applications listed on Page 1 of the disclosure. If available, please replace the docket numbers listed with the current USSN numbers.

Claim Objections

Claims 16, 18-21, and 23-29 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 16, 18-20, 23-25, and 29 recite the limitation "system" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. For the purpose of further examination, it is assumed claims 16, 18-20, 23-25, and 29 should be dependent upon claim 15 rather than claim 14.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "computer system" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of further examination, it is assumed that claim 21 should be dependent upon claim 15 rather than claim 19.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "printer" in line 1 and "coded data" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. For the purpose of further examination, it is assumed that claim 26 should be dependent upon claim 20 rather than claim 19.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "coded data" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of further examination, it is assumed that claim 27 should be dependent upon claim 20 rather than claim 19.

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 28 recites the limitations "coded data" and "identity" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. For the purpose of further examination, it is assumed that claim 28 should be dependent upon claim 20 rather than claim 19.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182).

As per claims 1 and 15, Nehab discloses a system and method of delivering a newspaper or magazine which includes formatting information of the newspaper or magazine in a computer system (See Nehab, Figure 9C, and Column 6, lines 63-65) where the information includes at least one user interactive element, in the form of a hyperlink, which enables a user to indicate a request for further information relating to contents of the newspaper or magazine by interacting with the element using a sensing

Art Unit: 2176

device, or mouse, which is adapted to transmit data indicating the request to the computer system (See Nehab, Figure 3A, and Column 6, lines 22-29), and printing the information at a printer networked with the computer system so as to produce the newspaper or magazine (See Nehab, Figure 8, Figure 1, element 7, and Column 12, lines 58-62).

As per claim 2, Nehab discloses that the further information relates to editorial content. (See Nehab, Column 21, line 32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Greening (U.S. Publication 2001/0012009 A1).

As per claims 3-4, 16-17, and 19, Nehab discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Nehab does not disclose expressly that the further information relates to advertising material which is included in the formatted information on the basis of demographics of the user. Greening discloses the inclusion of advertising materials based on a demographic profile of a user. (See Greening, Page 1, paragraph 0015). Nehab and Greening are analogous art because they are from the same field of

Art Unit: 2176

endeavor of presenting information to users over a computer network. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the advertising information based on user demographics of Greening with the further information of Nehab. The motivation for doing so would have been to create a personalized experience for the user. (See Greening, Page 1, paragraph 0014). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Greening with Nehab for the benefit of providing a personalized experience for the user to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3-4, 16-17 and 19.

As per claim 17, Nehab discloses the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Nehab does not disclose expressly that the further information relates to advertising material which is included with reference to user preferences. Greening discloses the inclusion of advertising materials based on user preferences. (See Greening, Page 1, paragraph 0015). Nehab and Greening are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting information to users over a computer network. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the advertising information based on user preferences of Greening with the further information of Nehab. The motivation for doing so would have been to create a personalized experience for the user. (See Greening, Page 1, paragraph 0014). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Greening with Nehab for the benefit of providing a personalized experience for the user to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Claims 5 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Nozue (U.S. Patent 5,845,262).

As per claims 5 and 20, Nehab discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 15 as described above. Nehab does not disclose expressly including coded data indicative of an identity of the newspaper or magazine and of the at least one interactive element and where the data includes receiving, in the computer system, indicating data from the sensing device regarding the identity of the newspaper or magazine and of a position of the sensing device relative to the newspaper or magazine in order to identify the newspaper or magazine and determine when the sensing device is used to interact with the element. Nozue discloses the inclusion of information identifying the newspaper or magazine which is transmitted from an electronic press to a data collection center. (See Nozue, Claim 12) Nehab and Nozue are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the transmittal of identity data of Nozue with the system and method of Nehab. The motivation for doing so would have been to classify the information by location or district. (See Nozue, Column 31, lines 41-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Nehab and Nozue for the benefit of classifying the data to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 20.

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) and Nozue (U.S. Patent 5,845,262) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of de Vries (U.S. Patent 5,819,032).

As per claim 6, Nehab and Nozue disclose the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Nehab and Nozue do not disclose expressly receiving, in the computer system, movement data regarding movement of the sensing device relative to the newspaper or magazine. De Vries discloses receiving data regarding the movement of the sensing device or mouse button in relation to its position on the screen. (See de Vries, Figure 2, Column 5, lines 66-67, and Column 6, lines 1-14). Nehab, Nozue and de Vries are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the movement data of the sensing device of de Vries with the system and method of Nehab and Nozue. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the user's position on the screen in relation to a hot spot which activates additional functionality. (See de Vries, Column 6, lines 5-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine de Vries with Nehab and Nozue for the benefit of determining the user's position on the display screen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

As per claim 7, Nehab, Nozue and de Vries disclose the limitations of claim 6 as described above. De Vries also discloses sensing the movement of the sensing device relative to the newspaper or magazine using the coded data, and identifying the response in the computer system from the movement being at least partially within a

Art Unit: 2176

zone associated with the interactive element. (See de Vries, Column 6, lines 5-12).

Nehab, Nozue and de Vries are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the movement of the sensing device in relation to a zone associated with an interactive element of de Vries with the system and method of Nehab, Nozue, and de Vries. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine whether to activate additional functionality based on the position of the sensing device on the display. (See de Vries, Column 6, lines 5-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine de Vries with Nehab and Nozue for the benefit of determining the user's intention to activate additional functionality to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Claims 8 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) as applied to claim 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162).

As per claims 8 and 23, Nehab discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 15 as described above. Nehab does not disclose expressly that the including an identification code specific to a particular user and the method includes monitoring use of the sensing device in the computer system. Smith discloses including an identification code and scanning the attributes of an object. (See Smith, Column 5, lines 3-7). Nehab and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a

Art Unit: 2176

person of ordinary skill in the art to include the monitoring of attributes to obtain an identification code of Smith with the system and method of Nehab. The motivation for doing so would have been to restrict access to an object. (See Smith, Column 5, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith with Nehab for the benefit of restricting user access to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8 and 23.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shibata (U.S. Patent 5,835,923).

As per claim 9, Nehab discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Nehab does not disclose expressly printing the newspaper or magazine on demand. Shibata discloses delivering a newspaper on demand. (See Shibata, Column 13, lines 47-58). Nehab and Shibata are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the on demand delivery of the newspaper of Shibata with the system and method of Nehab. The motivation for doing so would have been to produce a newspaper allowing for viewability, acquirability, portability and low cost. (See Shibata, Column 2, lines 56-60) Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shibata with Nehab for the benefit of providing an electronic newspaper with the above-mentioned advantages to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Claims 10-11 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) and Nozue (U.S. Patent 5,845,262) as applied to claims 5 and 20 above, and further in view of Reber (U.S. Patent 6,138,151).

As per claims 10-11 and 26-27, Nehab and Nozue disclose the limitations of claims 5 and 20 above. Nehab and Nozue do not disclose expressly printing the formatted information on a surface of a surface-defining structure and, at the same time, printing the coded data on the surface. Reber discloses retrieving the printed code and one of the articles corresponding to the printed code. (See Reber, Column 10, lines 41-63). Reber also discloses that a display device, which includes, by definition, a printer, without displaying the printed code, displays the article. (See Reber, Column 10, lines 41-63). Nehab, Nozue and Reber are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the displaying of data without the display of printed code of Reber with the system and method of Nehab and Nozue. The motivation for doing so would have been to address the content based upon the printed code without the need to display the printed code. (See Reber, Column 10, lines 50-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reber with Nehab and Nozue for the benefit of addressing the data without displaying the printed code to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10-11 and 26-27.

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) and Nozue (U.S. Patent 5,845,262) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162).

As per claim 12, Nehab and Nozue disclose the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Nehab and Nozue do not disclose expressly retaining a retrievable record of the printed newspaper or magazine which is retrievable using the identity data as contained in the coded data. Smith discloses including an identification code to maintain a record of the data. (See Smith, Column 5, lines 3-7). Nehab, Nozue and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the identification code used to maintain a record of the data of Smith with the system and method of Nehab and Nozue. The motivation for doing so would have been to restrict access to the data. (See Smith, Column 5, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith with Nehab for the benefit of restricting user access to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Franklin.

As per claim 13, Nehab discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Nehab does not disclose expressly including distributing a number of newspapers or magazines using a mixture of multicast and pointcast communications protocols.

Art Unit: 2176

Franklin discloses using a combination of delivery mechanisms, including both pointcast and multicast. (See Franklin, Page 97, column 1, paragraph 5). Nehab and Franklin are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of delivering information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the combination of delivery mechanisms of Franklin with the system and method of Nehab. The motivation for doing so would have been to control the costs of initiating the transfer of data. (See Franklin, Page 5, column 2, paragraph 2) Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Nehab for the benefit of controlling data transfer costs to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Claims 14 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) as applied to claim 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Wiedemer (U.S. Patent 5,860,781).

As per claims 14 and 29, Nehab discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 15 as described above. Nehab does not disclose expressly that the newspaper or magazine is printed on multiple pages and that the method includes binding the pages. Wiedemer discloses a binding or stitching device used to bind the pages of a document. (See Wiedemer, Column 4, lines 51-57). Nehab and Wiedemer are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the binding of pages of Wiedemer with the system and method of Nehab. The motivation

Art Unit: 2176

for doing so would have been to produce a document simply and cost-effectively. (See Wiedemer, Column 1, lines 54-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wiedemer with Nehab for the benefit of producing a document simply and with reasonable cost to obtain the invention as specified in claims 14 and 29.

Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of de Vries (U.S. Patent 5,819,032).

As per claim 21, Nehab discloses the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Nehab does not disclose expressly receiving, in the computer system, movement data regarding movement of the sensing device relative to the newspaper or magazine. De Vries discloses receiving data regarding the movement of the sensing device or mouse button in relation to its position on the screen. (See de Vries, Figure 2, Column 5, lines 66-67, and Column 6, lines 1-14). Nehab and de Vries are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the movement data of the sensing device of de Vries with the system and method of Nehab. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the user's position on the screen in relation to a hot spot which activates additional functionality. (See de Vries, Column 6, lines 5-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine de Vries with Nehab for the benefit of determining the user's position on the display screen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

Art Unit: 2176

As per claim 22, Nehab and de Vries disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. De Vries also discloses sensing the movement of the sensing device relative to the newspaper or magazine using the coded data, and identifying the response in the computer system from the movement being at least partially within a zone associated with the interactive element. (See de Vries, Column 6, lines 5-12). Nehab and de Vries are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the movement of the sensing device in relation to a zone associated with an interactive element of de Vries with the system and method of Nehab and de Vries. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine whether to activate additional functionality based on the position of the sensing device on the display. (See de Vries, Column 6, lines 5-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine de Vries with Nehab and de Vries for the benefit of determining the user's intention to activate additional functionality to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Dymetman (U.S. Patent 6,330,976).

As per claim 24, Nehab discloses the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Nehab does not disclose expressly that the sensing device includes a marking nib. Dymetman discloses a sensing device with a marking nib. (See Dymetman, Figure 8,

Art Unit: 2176

and Column 15, lines 29-52). Nehab and Dymetman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the sensing device with a marking nib of Dymetman with the system and method of Nehab. The motivation for doing so would have been to obtain the appropriate automatic action in a non-disruptive streamlined manner (See Dymetman, Column 3, lines 34-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dymetman with Nehab for the benefit of obtaining an appropriate action using the marking nib that does not impede the user's online experience to obtain the invention as specified in claim 24.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Shibata (U.S. Patent 5,835,923) and Reber (U.S. Patent 6,138,151).

As per claim 25, Nehab discloses the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Nehab does not disclose expressly including printing the formatted information on a surface of a surface-defining structure where the printer prints the newspaper or magazine on demand. Shibata discloses printing a newspaper on demand. (See Shibata, Column 13, lines 47-58). Reber discloses retrieving the printed code and one of the articles corresponding to the printed code. (See Reber, Column 10, lines 41-63). Nehab, Reber and Shibata are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the on demand

Art Unit: 2176

delivery of the newspaper of Shibata with the system and method of Nehab. The motivation for doing so would have been to produce a newspaper allowing for viewability, acquirability, portability and low cost. (See Shibata, Column 2, lines 56-60) At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the displaying of data of Reber with the system and method of Nehab and Shibata. The motivation for doing so would have been to address the content based upon the printed. (See Reber, Column 10, lines 50-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reber with Nehab and Shibata for the benefit of addressing the data based on the printed code to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab (U.S. Patent 6,029,182) and Nozue (U.S. Patent 5,845,262) as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Franklin.

As per claim 28, Nehab and Nozue disclose the limitations of claim 20 as described above. Nehab and Nozue do not disclose expressly including distributing a number of newspapers or magazines using a mixture of multicast and pointcast communications protocols. Franklin discloses using a combination of delivery mechanisms, including both pointcast and multicast. (See Franklin, Page 97, column 1, paragraph 5). Nehab, Nozue and Franklin are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of delivering information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the

Art Unit: 2176

combination of delivery mechanisms of Franklin with the system and method of Nehab and Nozue. The motivation for doing so would have been to control the costs of initiating the transfer of data. (See Franklin, Page 5, column 2, paragraph 2) Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Nehab and Nozue for the benefit of controlling data transfer costs to obtain the invention as specified in claim 28.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,230,173 B1) discloses a method for creating structured documents in a publishing system.
- Jones (U.S. Publication 2001/0047373 A1) discloses a publication file conversion and display.
- Walker (U.S. Patent 5,995,976) discloses a method and apparatus for distributing supplemental information related to printed articles.
- Gerwig discloses the use of push technology in relation to the Internet.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is currently (703) 605-1238. After mid-October, 2004, the examiner can be reached at (571) 272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can currently be reached on (703) 305-9792. After mid-October, 2004, the examiner's supervisor can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER